



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,620	04/10/2001	Jatinder Singh Sappal	600.1132	7989
23280	7590	05/05/2005	EXAMINER	
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC 485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10018			DURAND, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/829,620	Applicant(s) SAPPAL ET AL.	
	Examiner Paul Durand	Art Unit 3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8,10 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,9,11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,7,8,10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Michalik (US 5,057,064).

In regard to claims 1,8 and 12, Michalik discloses the invention as claimed including a collect cylinder to grip signatures 68, tucker in the form of folding blade, a jaw cylinder 1, interacting with the tucker with a stationary blade 16, independently adjustable by a bolt (no number given), moving blade 12 independently adjustable in respect to a tucker (see Figs. 1,2,7 and C3,L34 – C7,L54).

In regard to claim 7, Michalik discloses the invention substantially as claimed including cam adjustment means 39 (see Figs. 1,2,7 and C3,L34 – C7,L54).

In regard to claim 10, Michalik discloses the invention substantially as claimed including adjusting the stationary blade by bolt (no number given), while the moving jaw stays stationary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik.

In regard to claim 3, Michalik discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the use of a spider to hold the jaw parts. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of folding to provide spiders on a folding roll for the purpose of holding the folding jaws on a folding roll. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Michalik with a jaw spider for the purpose of holding the folding jaws on a folding roll.

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik in view of Johnson et al (US 4,519,596).

In regard to claim 5, Michalik discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the adjustment of the tucker blade. However, Johnson teaches that it is old and well known in the art of folding to provide a tucker blade 14, which can be adjusted by phasing box 27 for the purpose of accommodating different sized folding products (see Fig.3 and C2,L42-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Michalik with a tucker adjustment means as taught by Johnson for the purpose of accommodating different sized folding products.

In regard to claim 6, Michalik discloses the invention substantially as claimed including cam adjustment means 39 (see Figs. 1,2,7 and C3,L34 – C7,L54).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2,9 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Durand whose telephone number is 571-272-4459. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Durand
April 27, 2005



Rinaldi I. Rada
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700